United Nations A/53/PV.43

General Assembly

Official Records

Fifty-third Session

43rd plenary meeting
Monday, 26 October 1998, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Opertti ..... (Uruguay)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Agenda item 16 (*continued*)

Elections to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other elections

(a) Election of seven members of the Committee for Programme and Coordination

Note by the Secretary-General (A/53/440)

The President (*interpretation from Spanish*): In accordance with General Assembly decision 42/450 of 17 December 1987, the Assembly elects the members of the Committee for Programme and Coordination upon their nomination by the Economic and Social Council.

The Assembly has before it document A/53/440, which contains the nominations by the Economic and Social Council to fill the vacancies in the Committee that will occur as a result of the expiration on 31 December 1998 of the terms of office of China, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Togo and Uruguay.

Those States are eligible for immediate re-election.

I should like to remind members that, after 1 January 1999, the following States will still be members of the Committee: Argentina, Austria, the Bahamas, Brazil, Cameroon, the Congo, France, Germany, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Mexico, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, the Russian Federation, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Accordingly, those 26 States are not eligible in this election.

I should now like to inform members that the following States have been nominated by the Economic and Social Council. There are two African States for three vacancies: Benin and Egypt. There is one Latin American and Caribbean State for one vacancy: Uruguay. There are three Asian States for three vacancies: China, Japan and the Republic of Korea.

In accordance with rule 92 of the rules of procedure, all elections should be held by secret ballot. However, in accordance with paragraph 16 of decision 34/401, the Assembly may, in elections to subsidiary organs, dispense with secret balloting when the number of candidates corresponds to the number of seats to be filled.

The number of States nominated from among the African States, the Asian States and the Latin American and Caribbean States is equal to or does not exceed the number of seats to be filled in each of those regions.

May I therefore take it that the Assembly wishes to declare those States nominated by the Economic and

98-86185 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one month of the date of the meeting*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

Social Council from among the African States, the Asian States and the Latin American and Caribbean States — namely, Benin, China, Egypt, Japan, the Republic of Korea and Uruguay — elected members of the Committee for Programme and Coordination for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1999?

It was so decided.

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I congratulate the States that have been elected members of the Committee for Programme and Coordination.

Regarding the one vacancy remaining from among the African States and the one vacancy remaining from among the Western Europe and other States held over from a previous session, the General Assembly will be in a position to act on them upon the nomination by the Economic and Social Council of one Member State from each of those two regions.

I therefore propose that the Assembly keep this sub-item on the agenda of the fifty-third session.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to that procedure.

It was so decided.

The President (*interpretation from Spanish*): We have thus concluded this stage of our consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 16.

Agenda item 17

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments

(h) Appointment of a member of the Joint Inspection Unit

Note by the Secretary-General (A/53/109)

The President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: As indicated in document A/53/109, the General Assembly is required during the fifty-third session to appoint a member to fill the vacancy on the Joint Inspection Unit that will arise from the expiration of the term of office on 31 December 1999 of Mr. Sumihiro Kuyama of Japan.

As also indicated in document A/53/109, in accordance with article 3, paragraph 1, of the statute of the Joint Inspection Unit, the President of the General Assembly shall consult with Member States to draw up a list of countries — in this case, one country — that would be requested to propose a candidate for appointment to the Joint Inspection Unit.

After holding the necessary consultations, I should like to communicate to the Assembly the information, received from the Chairman of the Group of Asian States, that the Group of Asian States has agreed that Japan should propose one candidate for the vacancy.

In accordance with article 3, paragraph 1, of the statute of the Joint Inspection Unit, Japan will therefore be requested to propose a candidate and a curriculum vitae highlighting the candidate's relevant qualifications for the task ahead.

After holding the appropriate consultations described in article 3, paragraph 2, of the statute of the Joint Inspection Unit, including consultations with the President of the Economic and Social Council and with the Secretary-General in his capacity as Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Coordination, I will submit to the Assembly a qualified candidate for appointment to the Joint Inspection Unit.

We have thus concluded this stage of our consideration of sub-item (h) of agenda item 17.

Agenda item 51

Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion

Draft resolution (A/53/L.7/Rev.1)

The President (*interpretation from Spanish*): I give the floor to the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to introduce draft resolution A/53/L.7/Rev.1.

Mr. Dorda (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): In the aftermath of the collapse, almost a decade ago, of the international balance — or, in the terms used by some, when the cold war ended — people of goodwill believed that the era of tensions, conflicts, wars and the arms race was for ever gone. They believed that the international community could breathe a little easier; that the world would witness a new phase in its

history, a phase of constructive cooperation; that savings and revenues would be devoted to development and to the achievement of progress within a framework of complementary action. This was their optimistic explanation of the other term they coined, "the new world order". However, no sooner had the people of goodwill awakened from their daydreams than they realized that what had really happened and what was taking place on the ground was different from their expectations and hopes.

Their dreams rapidly evaporated. They realized that they had no time even for daydreaming. Instead of one cold war, they witnessed the eruption of, or caused to erupt, several "hot" wars that consumed the blood of innocent human beings. Some of these wars were stopped and some temporarily abated. Some of them are still raging and some simmering. However, all of them have taken human lives in numbers too high to count and have left behind incalculable damage and destruction. All the losses have yet to be tallied. The only increases have been in the membership of the United Nations, the number of refugee camps and the number of hungry and orphaned. The sigh of relief has given way in this era to confusion, fear and anxiety caused by pressures, threats and orders imposed from above.

Instead of constructive cooperation, an era of embargoes, boycotts and economic blockades was ushered in. In terms of both human and material casualties, the victims of this era may surpass in numbers the victims of destructive wars. After all these years have elapsed, and since the collapse of international balance — or as the others may say, "the end of the cold war" — all dreams, hopes, and wishes have indeed evaporated. There was a stark new awakening to the light of a bitter truth.

The international community realized that the victor of a non-war — the so-called cold war — had decided to put its political, economic, cultural and social stamp on the world. The world would merely have to listen and obey. This applies even to the victor's closest allies. That victor also decided that its interests came above and before everyone else's interests, even those who shared common interests with that victor.

The victor in the cold war believed that the international situation had become ripe for it to dictate its conditions and issue its orders so that it could re-draw the world map in a manner that would guarantee its own interests before the rise of any kind of international equilibrium or balance, and could pre-empt the rise of such a balance.

Now, those countries that disobey the aforementioned orders and try to build their own societies based on their own particularities, and as an extension of their own roots, or based on their intellectual convictions or political and economic options, are qualified as "rogue States". Orders were issued to freeze the assets and funds of such countries that were invested in the country concerned. Even their imports, which were fully paid for and which met all applicable international legal conditions, were frozen. Then laws were enacted which would punish the rest of the countries of the world if they dealt with these countries or if their dealings with them exceeded a certain limit.

It is indeed a new world order. But why all of this?

Let us reply to this question by raising some questions of our own: First, why was Libya not punished before 1 September 1969, the date of its revolution? Second, was this due to the fact that before that date, Libya had accepted the establishment of military bases on its soil? Was it because after that date Libya cleared out those bases, liberating its land and skies? Third, was it because before that date Libya had signed concessions with American oil companies that focused on the interests of those companies at the expense of the interests of the Libyan people? And because after that date, Libya corrected all mistakes retroactively, thus restoring to the Libyan people their usurped rights?

Fourth, was it because Libya, prior to that date, had accepted being an occupied dependency when the treaty concluded with the United States deprived Libya of the simplest elements of sovereignty over its own territory? At that time, Libyan police could not apprehend the pilots who used Libyan shepherds and their sheep as training targets and killed them. Libya's prosecutorial authorities were unable to investigate, and its courts were unable to try, the culprits for their premeditated crimes. Even children were not spared these training runs. As a result, a young girl named Emmetika was killed, together with a number of other children. The air base, formerly known as Wheelus Air Base, now carries the name Emmetika as a sign of respect commemorating her and all those martyrs who were killed by aerial bombardment or under the wheels of vehicles driven by clearly inebriated soldiers and officers from American military bases. These incidents are documented with dates and places. We can provide this information via the Internet so that it will be known for sure that we are not falsely accusing anyone.

Was this also due to the fact that, after that date, Libya achieved true independence and freed its decision-making from any dependence on anyone? Fifth, where are the human rights of those martyrs? Are they not human beings like any other human beings? Or, perhaps, human rights, too, have taken their leave?

Sixth, why was Iran not punished before its Islamic Revolution? Why is it being punished now? Seventh, why was the Shah of Iran supported at a time when he was filling all prisons with all free men and all those who differed with him in opinion, and while his intelligence service — the SAVAK — was the most infamous organ of suppression in the second half of this century? Perhaps that was not terrorism, because it was in the service of the interests of those who made the Shah the policeman in the area against those who did care for the interests of their homeland, Iran. Human rights at the time must have been in some sort of coma.

Eighth, why are Iran's assets frozen? Why is an embargo imposed against it and against those who cooperate with it for good and prosperity? Is it because Iran decided to be independent and refrained from performing the role of the policeman previously performed by the Shah? Is it because Iran decided to be the master of its own destiny? Or is it perhaps because it returned to its roots and its religion and decided to shed all that is alien to it?

Ninth, why is the Democratic People's Republic of Korea being punished? Who fought against whom? Which divided itself from the other? Which is standing against reunification with the other? Why do we not leave every society to itself, to decide its own destiny, without any interference?

Viet Nam and Germany are good living examples. Until recently, the call for the unification of Germany could have been called an aberration. My country did not fear being accused of such an aberration. Our leader, from the rostrum of the Non-Aligned Movement summit in Belgrade, called for the reunification of Germany. Those who did not have political vision, those who did not read human history and thus were unable to absorb its lessons, were surprised at such a call. Yet Germany today is one united country. Social facts impose themselves on events of both history and geography. But who is able to learn such lessons?

Tenth, why is the Sudan being punished now? Is it because it is no longer Numayri's Sudan? Or because it is laying the basis for a path linking it to its own roots, history and environment? Maybe that is why the Sudan is being strangled. Or is it because the democracy of religious sects was better than the existing political regime in the Sudan? Does anybody have the right to impose a political formula on others? From where did they acquire such a right? Who gave them such a mandate? And why did the United States exclude Arabic gum products from the embargo? Perhaps Arabic gum is not Sudanese.

Eleventh, why is Cuba being punished? The statement made several days ago in this Hall by the Foreign Minister of Cuba gave all the answers to that question.

The acceptance of the right of a certain country to enact and implement extraterritorial laws could set a precedent for all other countries, enabling them to enact similar extraterritorial laws and to try to give them effect. In this case, would the world in which we live be civilized, or would it become a jungle?

Among the options that cannot be precluded is the fact that the producers of any given commodity, and especially raw materials, could be forced to establish special organizations among themselves to preserve their interests in the international market, be they agricultural, mineral or other. Such action would be justifiable by a number of objective considerations, not to mention the interests of those concerned. Various regions might be forced to set up their own economic groupings and pressures would be ineffective because the situation has become one of life or death. Continents could soon become self-contained economic frameworks, regardless of all internal and external conditions. This is no longer an option — it is now a very urgent and vital necessity.

The international community is called upon to do away with a precedent that could take the world to the brink of the unknown, with all its possible consequences and repercussions. I can understand that one member or even several members may have their own view of Libya; that is their right. Certainly, Libya has its own opinion of a certain country and even of several countries. Libya is, in turn, entitled to that opinion. However, the draft resolution before the Assembly today does not concern Libya alone and its wording is very clear to all. This is a common issue which concerns the entire international community. The voting will be on the subject matter, and not on Libya. Thus, it would be meaningless to agree to the content of the draft resolution and then to abstain from voting in favour of it. Any explanation of an abstention would also be absolutely meaningless.

The subject of the draft resolution relates to what is enacted by States, and not to what is enacted by the United Nations. Thus, this cannot justify or explain any abstention either. Those who support the content of the draft resolution must not fail to hit the green button when voting begins.

Mr. Donokusumo (Indonesia): On behalf of the Group of 77 and China, I would like to make a few brief and general comments on this important draft resolution.

In this era of globalization and liberalization, the practice of imposing unilateral coercive measures of an extraterritorial nature has accrued additional serious dimensions and its impact can have devastating consequences for the affected countries. Such practices run counter to the imperatives of international cooperation for development and to the spirit of partnership being fostered in the increasingly interdependent world. Moreover, the imposition of such measures by one country on another contravenes international law and is totally incompatible, not only with international rules and regulations, but also with the principles of equal sovereignty, non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States.

As a result, such coercive actions prevent the affected countries from enjoying their equal and non-discriminatory rights in pursuing development and from freely expanding their international trade. In fact, resolution 1994/47 of the Commission on Human Rights states that such measures, unilaterally implemented against developing countries, hinder the full realization of all rights set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, particularly the right of people to a minimum standard of living and development. In addition, in his subsequent report (E/CN.4/1995/43), responding to this resolution, the Secretary-General stated that the application of such measures is incompatible with the principle of international cooperation, has a negative impact on the economies of the developing countries suffering these measures, and constitutes a serious violation of the human rights of the affected individuals, groups and peoples.

For these purposes, the international community should work together, striving to ensure that countries refrain from such activities. In this regard, it is necessary to ensure that the World Trade Organization be kept free of political constraints and be economy-oriented. The international community should also seek to promote the right to development of all countries, in conformity with the principles and spirit of the United Nations and its Charter.

Mr. Wilmot (Ghana): A few days ago, in this very Hall, the General Assembly adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution on the necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba. Today, the Assembly is being called upon to consider the need to eliminate coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion.

Although, prima facie, the scope of the present agenda item is more general than that of the resolution adopted a few days ago, the underlying principles at stake are the same in the two cases. Consequently, the reasons which informed the massive condemnation of the economic embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba hold true for the elimination of coercive measures generally as a means of political and economic compulsion.

The main objective of all such measures is to prevent the targeted State or States from exercising their right to decide, voluntarily, their own political, economic and social systems. But that runs counter to the cardinal principle of the United Nations Charter, which upholds the sovereign equality of States and non-intervention and non-interference in their internal affairs.

Again, the legislation backing such measures, epitomized by the so-called Helms-Burton and D'Amato-Kennedy Acts passed by the United States Congress, have extraterritorial effects which adversely affect the sovereignty of third States, the legitimate interests of entities or persons under their jurisdiction and the freedom of trade and navigation. From that perspective, the legislation violates not only the principles and purposes of the United Nations and the norms of international law, but also freedom of international trade and navigation, which is enshrined in many international legal instruments, including those of the World Trade Organization.

Another feature of the measures in question, and the legislation backing them, is that they are unilateral in nature, taken without any regard whatsoever to the United Nations Charter principle requiring all Member States to refrain from the threat or use of force in their international relations or to the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter, which call on Member States to settle disputes by peaceful means such as negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and judicial settlement.

We are also disturbed by the recent attempt to introduce new concepts of international law aimed at internationalizing the essential elements contained in extraterritorial laws through multilateral agreements. We reject outright all such attempts, as we do the present trend to strengthen and expand these elements through the Bretton Woods institutions. We also reaffirm our rejection of evaluations, certifications and other coercive measures used as a tool for pressurizing Member States.

There have been numerous resolutions in the past in which this Assembly has called upon Member States to take urgent and effective steps to end coercive economic measures in their international relations. Notable among them is General Assembly resolution 51/22 of 1996. At their recent summit meeting, held in Durban in September this year, the heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement reaffirmed their rejection of all such measures and of the enactment of extraterritorial laws as being incompatible with international law and the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. Earlier in the year, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity also adopted a decision expressing concern at the continued imposition of extraterritorial coercive measures and calling for their elimination. Furthermore, on several occasions, the heads of State or Government at the Ibero-American Summits have called for the elimination of unilateral economic and trade measures by one State against another that affect the free flow of international trade. And just a few days ago, the entire European Union, speaking in this Assembly through its spokesman, the representative of Austria, expressed its vehement opposition to unilateral coercive legislation which has extraterritorial effects.

For all these reasons, my delegation calls once more upon States which apply unilateral coercive measures to put an immediate end to them. We also call on all States not to recognize any legislative enactments which back such measures.

We wish to conclude by reiterating that it is the inalienable right of every State, however small, however weak and however poor, to choose the political, economic and social system that it deems appropriate for the well-being of its people, in accordance with its own national plans, policies and priorities. No other State has the prerogative or the right to interfere in the exercise of such choice.

My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/53/L.7/Rev.1.

Ms. Flórez Prida (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The position of the Government of the Republic of Cuba on the item that has brought us together today is very well known. The Government of the Republic of Cuba made public its rejection of the 1996 Iran and Libya Sanctions Act, also known as the D'Amato-Kennedy Act, from the very moment that it was passed. Consequently, we voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 51/22, which called for the immediate repeal of unilateral extraterritorial laws that impose sanctions on companies and nationals of third States and which also called for such measures not to be recognized.

By means of that law the United States of America is seeking once again to extend the scope of its domestic legislation to third States — an action that has repeatedly been denounced — in this case, by applying sanctions on companies and individuals from countries that trade with or invest in the oil sectors of Libya and Iran.

The enactment of such measures reveals the true nature of the policy being pursued by those countries that claim to promote trade liberalization but that at the same time seek to impose their domestic legislation on all other countries, including their closest allies, without any moral, legal or political basis.

Although it has been recognized by a number of General Assembly resolutions, it is necessary to reiterate that the application of such measures by one country against another is a blatant violation of international law and of the principles of the Charter, including the sovereign equality of States and non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States.

The international community has repeatedly condemned the damaging effects of the application of such measures on the health, well-being and enjoyment of human rights of people, in particular those in the most vulnerable sectors of the countries to which they are applied.

My country profoundly believes that in the current international circumstances the international community must prevent the proliferation of such measures, particularly those that are extraterritorial, and demand an end to such practices.

Accepting such legislation would mean recognizing a system of international relations that favours the hegemony and irresponsible policy of one great Power.

My delegation, consistent with its condemnation of any extraterritorial act that violates the sovereignty of peoples, associates itself with the broad international rejection of this kind of legislation and trusts that the United Nations will play its proper role in ensuring that the will and the decisions of the international community in this regard are upheld.

Consequently, the Cuban delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/53/L.7/Rev.1, entitled "Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion".

Mr. Al-Hitti (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): May we at the outset express our thanks and appreciation to the fraternal delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for its efforts to have this item included in the agenda of the Assembly.

The international community has been overwhelmingly preoccupied in recent years due to the increased arbitrary use of economic and political coercive measures — whether imposed unilaterally or collectively, under the banner of the United Nations — through the abuse of authority by some of the powerful States in the Security Council.

The numerous reports adopted by the specialized agencies of the United Nations and intergovernmental or non-governmental organizations have all confirmed beyond any doubt that these coercive measures affect directly and dangerously all aspects of society, economy, health and education in all countries targeted by these sanctions. Their negative impact on those affected will continue for many generations to come as a result of the concomitant physical and psychological trauma left after the sanctions are lifted.

As is well known, this economic and political coercion affects third countries linked through economic relations with this or that targeted country. This endangers the international trade system and international relations as a whole.

The Charter clearly states the circumstances in which the international community may have to resort to the use of economic sanctions. The first of these is the existence of any threat to international peace and security, provided that all preventive or pre-emptive measures together with other undertakings, such as international arbitration and mediation in conflicts and the assignment of a role to regional organizations to find adequate solutions to conflict, have all failed.

It is unfortunate that many States, particularly influential States in the Security Council, rode roughshod over these standards and began imposing coercive economic and political measures against other States. This was done for no other reason than the refusal by those States to acquiesce to the will of hegemonic States on the international political scene. Experience has already shown that these States care for nothing other than their own narrow national interests when dealing with important international issues.

Differences of opinion between States are in the nature of things. What is not normal is for some States to regard these differences as a basis for adopting policies that run counter to international law with a view to forcing other countries to change their political and economic approach in a way that would make them responsive to the political or economic approach followed by the States that impose these policies. That is so even if this approach runs completely counter to the interests of the countries on which coercive political and economic measures are imposed.

We believe that the General Assembly, which represents the will of the international community, is the appropriate forum in which to discuss this important and critical question.

My delegation therefore calls on all Member States to pool their efforts in order to stand up to the policies of imposing coercive economic and political measures — policies that would not shy away from using food and medicine as a weapon to bring political pressure to bear on countries that are trying to break out of dependency and to safeguard the independence of their political decision-making. All of these are rights guaranteed to all States by the Charter and by the principles and custom of international law.

Mrs. Bashir (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is a tribute to the Assembly that it provides an important rostrum for weak States to be heard — States targeted by the forces of aggression and injustice.

Once again, the Assembly is today debating the unilateral use by a major Power of coercive political and economic measures as a means of putting pressure on other sovereign States in an attempt to coerce them into dependence.

At the last session, in resolution 52/181, the General Assembly expressed deep concern because the unilateral

use of such measures adversely affects the economies and the development efforts of developing countries. Moreover, such measures have a negative impact on international economic cooperation and on worldwide efforts to institute a non-discriminatory and open multilateral trading system. In the same resolution, the General Assembly urged the international community to adopt urgent effective measures to stop the use by some developed States of coercive economic measures against developing States in order to avoid a contradiction with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

At last session's debate, it was demonstrated that such coercive economic measures are illegal and that they run counter to the most fundamental principles of peaceful coexistence and international economic cooperation. They also contradict the international consensus on the need for a more open, non-discriminatory world trading system, and call into question the credibility of the noble standards of trust and the supremacy of the rule of law, which are important underpinnings of international relations and of relations between States.

The United States of America has ignored numerous General Assembly resolutions; in fact, it has expanded its use of these coercive economic measures, to the point that now there are more than 70 States, including my country, against which the United States Administration has issued presidential decrees. The political motivation for this coercive United States action has sent the wrong message to insurrectionist movements in my country; this in turn has hampered the peace talks that were under way in Nairobi when the United States decree was issued.

The United States continued its aggression against Sudan when, on 20 August 1998, it launched a missile attack on a plant producing human and veterinary pharmaceuticals, located in the heart of our capital, Khartoum. The United States justified its heinous crime with empty arguments and baseless allegations which lacked any proof. The United States Administration still rejects Sudan's call — which enjoys the support of the overwhelming majority of Member States — for the Security Council to send a fact-finding mission to look into these allegations.

In conclusion, my delegation reaffirms that the use of such coercive economic measures violates the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, their national sovereignty, and their political and development choices based on their own economic and cultural criteria. My delegation also affirms that ignoring General Assembly resolutions calling for an end to such measures can only hamper — indeed, destroy — the principles of dialogue and the peaceful settlement of disputes between States.

My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/53/L.7/Rev.1.

Mr. Nejad-Hosseinian (Islamic Republic of Iran): Powerful transnational forces are at work reshaping the key features of world markets in capital, goods, services, labour and technology. As discussed in detail here in the Assembly in the course of the two-day high-level dialogue back in September, the twin processes of globalization and liberalization have expanded and deepened the mutual interdependence of societies, which has in turn increased the potential for international interaction and cooperation. In such an environment, recourse to unilateral and extraterritorial coercive economic measures is a serious threat to the basic principles and the foundations of the international economic, trade and financial system.

The impermissibility under international law of unilateral and extraterritorial sanctions against other countries is uniformly recognized by the international community. The adoption of coercive economic measures falls within the mandate of the United Nations only in particular situations where there exists a threat to the peace or a breach of the peace. Moreover, several relevant principles set forth in the Charter provide a solid basis for the Organization to offset the exercise of unilateral sanctions by individual States. United Nations documentation against unilateral action is comprehensive. According to General Assembly resolutions, unilateral coercive measures violate the principles of non-intervention, non-interference in the internal and external affairs of other States, and the exercise by States of their sovereign rights. In this regard, both paragraph 2 of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, resolution 2131 (XX) of 21 December 1965, and article 32 of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, resolution 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, stipulate that

> "No State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights", with the former Declaration adding "or to secure from it advantages of any kind".

Moreover, the General Assembly has denounced on various occasions unilateral and extraterritorial economic coercion as a means of achieving political goals. Resolutions on economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries adopted at the forty-fourth, forty-sixth, forty-eighth, fiftieth and fifty-second sessions of the General Assembly, and the resolution entitled "Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion" adopted at the fifty-first session are prominent examples of the series of United Nations responses to such unlawful actions.

Mr. Ka (Senegal), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The imposition of coercive economic measures and the enactment of domestic legislation with extraterritorial implications for the horizontal escalation of such actions and measures also contradict provisions of established international trade law, including those under World Trade Organization (WTO) regulations.

Various forms of coercive economic measures and actions were imposed against 79 foreign countries, in particular developing countries, between 1979 and 1992, and from 1993 to 1996 unilateral sanctions were imposed no fewer than 61 times against 35 countries. These statistics indicate that recourse to such measures and actions has been on the rise in terms of number, and that these measures have intensified in severity in recent years. The nature of such illegal measures has also changed; for example, they now take the form of measures with extraterritorial implications against the trade and investment partners of targeted countries. This unfortunate development and the consequent violation of the sovereignty of other States have recently taken on dangerous dimensions. They contravene the principle of territoriality of national laws and the legitimate interests of companies and persons falling under their jurisdiction.

Recourse to unilateral measures has had a serious adverse impact on the economic, trade and financial relations of countries from both North and South with the targeted developing countries. The main targets, however, are companies and legal persons and entities of these very countries which are prohibited from engaging in economic, commercial and financial relations with targeted countries. Such actions create serious distortions in the international economy, impede an expansion of North-South and South-South relations, hinder regional cooperation among developing countries and impose tremendous costs on other regional countries in their endeavours towards integration in the international economy.

In almost all United Nations resolutions and decisions on financial and commercial issues and related financial declarations and conclusions of high-level meetings in the entire system, the critical need for an equitable, rule-based, secure, non-discriminatory and predictable multilateral trading system has been emphasized. The necessity of a favourable and conducive international economic and financial environment and a positive investment climate as a means to facilitate and promote the participation of developing countries in international trade and finance has also been endorsed year after year by Member States by consensus. These instruments have, *inter alia*, invariably called on all countries to abolish all measures which could impede free international trade and financial transactions. The commitment to uphold and strengthen the multilateral trading system for the economic and social advancement of all countries and peoples was reaffirmed and renewed in the ministerial communiqué of the high-level segment of the 1998 substantive session of the Economic and Social Council, held in July this year.

On the basis of these principles and commitments, the international community has vigorously reacted to these illegal measures and actions. Developed countries have also discussed and rejected the enactment of these illegal instruments within various existing coordination frameworks among themselves and have used international and intergovernmental mechanisms to pre-empt recourse to such measures. The adoption in November 1996 by the Council of Ministers of the European Union of a regulation and a joint action to protect the interests of natural or legal persons residing in the European Union against extraterritorial legislation is a case in point. Developing countries have also individually enacted legal measures rendering any foreign legislation which is directly or indirectly aimed at restricting or impeding the free flow of trade and investment to the detriment of any country inapplicable and without legal effect within their national territories. The same has taken place in regional, intergovernmental and international meetings among developing countries.

The twelfth summit of the Non-Aligned Movement in Durban; the thirty-fourth regular Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity in Ouagadougou; the eighth session of the Islamic Summit Conference in Tehran; and the twenty-second annual meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the

Group of 77 and China in New York have all rejected recourse to such illegal unilateral and extraterritorial measures. It is also worth mentioning that consideration of this crucial issue at all recent international conferences, summits and other high-level meetings is a manifestation of the multidimensional character of these unlawful measures which adversely affect all countries and the global economy as a whole.

Finally, the legislation known as the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act is an obvious example of extraterritorial coercive economic measures. It is a United States domestic instrument without any foundation in international law which has targeted the economic, commercial and financial relations of other countries with the Islamic Republic of Iran. As is fully known and has been further corroborated by recent developments, external pressures on oil companies to stay away from investing in the development of Iranian oil and gas projects has not encountered success. Moreover, that legislation, whose enactment is known to be a product of domestic politicking, contradicts the provisions of the Declaration of Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States. We call upon all the Member States of the United Nations to refrain from recourse to such measures and to nullify any already in place. In our view, the draft resolution entitled "Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion" is an appropriate response on the part of the General Assembly to such unlawful and illegal measures. It represents our collective commitment to the principles, goals and objectives enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, recognized principles and norms of international law and the provisions of the existing related international instruments. It deserves to be adopted by consensus by the General Assembly.

Mr. Kafando (Burkina Faso) (*interpretation from French*): The discussion of agenda item 51 provides the opportunity for us to speak very briefly on the problem of eliminating coercive economic measures used to exert political and economic pressure. This raises once again the thorny issue of sanctions.

As we know, sanctions were originally among the political means to which States could resort in order to make recalcitrant members of the international community listen to reason. Relevant international law has done everything possible to incorporate sanctions into the arsenal of political and legal coercive measures. However, since the founding of the United Nations, sanctions have tended to be an exception among exceptions, in that they were intended to be used with great caution and discretion, as is the case with any weapon. This means that they should be used only once peaceful means, such as negotiation, mediation and conciliation, have been exhausted. It is in this sense that the Charter of the United Nations clearly spells out in Article 2, paragraph 3, that:

> "All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered."

But it is precisely economic sanctions that are most unjust and the most harmful, because of their contagious effects and the insidious damage they inflict. If a country cannot for four, five or six years export its products or obtain foodstuffs from abroad, imagine the suffering of the people of that country. The paradox is this: the quest to punish a State for a serious failing or for an offence it has committed — in other words, because an injustice has taken place — results in another injustice: starving a population that, in terms of the scale of responsibility, is completely innocent. Herein lies the iniquity of economic coercion.

In the case of Libya, which for seven years now has been a classic example, it is the Libyan people who have been paying a high price in the form of the many privations they must endure daily. This is an absurd situation. The attempt to right the wrongs caused by the tragedy of Pan Am flight 103 has succeeded only in creating more suffering: that of the families of the victims of this tragedy, who continue to live with the frustration of unanswered questions and especially the knowledge that the matter has now become a problem between States; and that of the Libyan people, who are wondering why they should experience such misfortune.

Based primarily on these humanitarian considerations, the African heads of State, on their part, decided on the elimination of unjust and unilateral economic measures against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. They noted further that the effects of those measures had spilled over beyond the region of the country involved, in violation of international law, and thereby endangered the interests of other countries, in particular those of the developing countries. They stated also that those measures were at the root of the economic and social ills suffered by neighbouring countries and peoples.

I have spoken only of Africa here, but it is clear that criticism of such measures is now very widespread. The

Non-Aligned Movement, for instance, at its most recent summit in South Africa recalled the unjust nature of economic coercion. Eminent voices such as those of His Holiness John Paul II have spoken out against these same measures, in particular those against Cuba. For all these reasons, we should support draft resolution A/53/L.7/Rev.1.

Mr. Al-Nasser (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): As Chairman of the Islamic Group, I have the honour to speak today on item 51 of the agenda of the fifty-third session of the General Assembly, entitled "Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion".

Allow me at the outset to extend to Mr. Opertti sincere congratulations on his election as President of the current session of the General Assembly and to wish him every success. I am fully confident that his experience and statesmanship will stand us in good stead in the conduct of our work.

At a time when we are looking forward to entering the twenty-first century in a spirit of tolerance, amity and brotherhood among all humankind, the elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion has become an urgent need in order to get rid of the effects of the use of force and the confrontational thinking that prevailed in international relations during the cold-war era. These were a stumbling-block on the path of the economic development of developing countries.

Coercive economic measures run counter to the "Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations", adopted by the General Assembly on 24 October 1970 by resolution 2625 (XXV), which states that

> "No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements, are in violation of international law." (*see resolution 2625 (XXV), annex, para. 1*)

The Declaration also states that

> "No State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights and to secure from it advantages of any kind." *(ibid.)*

General Assembly resolution 51/22 recalled its numerous resolutions in which it called upon the international community to take urgent and effective steps to end coercive economic measures, and expressed grave concern over the recent enactment of extraterritorial coercive economic laws in contravention of the norms of international law, the aims and purposes of the United Nations and the relevant provisions of the World Trade Organization.

That resolution reaffirmed the inalienable right of States to economic and social development and to choose their political, economic and social system on the basis of the international Organization's commitment to the consolidation of the rights of peoples embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and international law, in the interest of achieving the Organization's objectives of the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Islamic Group, proceeding from the precepts of its glorious religion, its profound belief in the establishment of justice among humankind and its adherence to the principles of international law, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and its noble objectives calling for the immediate elimination of extraterritorial, unilateral laws, urges the international community to promptly take steps to put an end to the use of unilateral measures against developing countries. Here I should like to recall resolution 15/8 adopted by the eighth Islamic Summit Conference, held in Tehran from 9 to 11 December 1997. It reaffirmed that unilateral measures affecting other parties and the attempt to enforce domestic law in the territories of other States are in contravention of the principles of international law governing relations among States and the United Nations Charter, which sets forth the obligation of all States not to interfere in the internal affairs of other States and to settle their disputes by peaceful means.

The resolution called on States, *inter alia*, to consider the so-called D'Amato Act in contravention of international law and norms and to regard it as null and void. In this regard, I also would like to recall paragraph 69 of the final communiqué of the twenty-fifth session of the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Organization

of the Islamic Conference, held in Doha, Qatar, from 15 to 17 March 1998. Inspired by the aforementioned principles, in this paragraph:

> "The Conference reaffirmed its solidarity with the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Great Socialist Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for their position concerning the so-called D'Amato Law and rejected any arbitrary or unilateral measure, whether political or legal applied by one country against another one. It urges all States to consider this law which is against the international law and norms, as null and void."

Voting in favour of the draft resolution before us today is an imperative dictated by our responsibility to adhere to the provisions and principals of international law and to achieve the noble aims of the United Nations Charter, while taking full account of the general principles governing the international trade system and trade policies for development which are included in the relevant resolutions, norms and provisions of the United Nations and the World Trade Organization.

Mr. Li Hyong Chol (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea believes that the discussion of agenda item 51, entitled "Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion" is very timely and significant, as it reflects the current international situation. Elimination of unilateral coercive economic measures is a fundamental condition for the establishment of democratic and equitable international economic relations.

Today, power politics still remain intact, even though humankind is at the threshold of a new millennium after the cold war. This reality indeed casts a gloom over the prospects for international relations and also runs counter to this era's trend towards a peaceful and just new world. As reality shows, coercive economic measures serve only as tools of power politics.

Sanction measures now being applied cannot and should not be tolerated, either in view of their purpose, pursuing political and economic pressure, or of the unacceptable logical and legal grounds used to justify their application and their catastrophic consequences.

In this connection, the international community should pay serious attention to the question of upon whom and on what grounds the sanctions are imposed, and it should work out a fair solution. In many instances, the target States of the sanctions are small States whose social systems and political policies and positions are alleged to be reason for sanctions. It is both serious and deplorable that the situation, which is characterized by coercive sanctions and domination by power, has been created as a result of extraterritorial and arbitrary laws and acts on the part of certain big Powers.

The use of forcible means in pursuit of political aims is a clear violation of the purposes of the United Nations Charter, the principles of international law, resolutions of the General Assembly and the declarations and programmes of action of major international conferences.

Chapter I, Article 1 of the Charter establishes that the development of friendly relations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination and achieving international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social and cultural character should be the main purpose of relations between the countries. In addition, article 32 of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, contained in General Assembly resolution 3281 (XXIX), states that

> "No State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights."

In particular, the just demand of the developing countries and their efforts to include the issue of ending unilateral coercive economic measures in the agenda of the General Assembly has been met since 1989. Accordingly, a number of resolutions and decisions — such as resolution 51/22 on "Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion" and resolution 52/181 on "Unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries" — were adopted in subsequent Assembly sessions.

In addition, the declarations and programmes of action adopted at such major conferences of the United Nations as the World Summit for Social Development and the Fourth World Conference on Women, held in recent years, condemned unilateral economic-sanction measures as acts of interference in the internal affairs of the sovereign States as well as gross human rights violations, and they called for the repealing of such coercive measures and laws.

However, in disregard of the requirements of the current era, certain countries still continue to resort to frequent imposition of economic sanctions upon developing countries as a means of coercive political and economic pressure. This is an unpardonable challenge to the international community which can never be justified.

The most prolonged and severe coercive economic measures of this kind in our century are none other than the unilateral economic sanctions and blockade imposed by the United States upon the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. By means of more than a dozen laws, such as the Trading with the Enemy Act and Foreign Assets Control Regulations, legislated on 28 July and 17 December 1950 respectively, the United States has been continuously imposing comprehensive economic sanctions upon our Republic and its population for almost half a century.

What makes this more serious is that, even though four years have elapsed since the conclusion by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States of America of the Agreed Framework — which, it was hoped, would promote the improvement of relations between both countries — the United States has not taken steps to lift the sanctions imposed upon us, thus failing to fulfil its commitment, and it has imposed further conditions for lifting the sanctions. It continues to resort to a hostile policy towards us.

All of this attests to the fact that the United States has been using economic sanctions as a hostile policy and a means of compulsion aimed at isolating and stifling our Republic. If anachronistic pressure and blackmail continue to remain unchecked, they will present a dangerous element that may bring about another type of cold war by inciting confrontation and hostility among countries.

My delegation takes this opportunity to reiterate that Member States of the United Nations should pay due attention to the early implementation of the United Nations resolutions concerning the elimination of sanctions as a means of political and economic pressure, including unilateral coercive economic measures against developing countries, and they should make every effort to that end.

My delegation also urges that unilateral coercive economic measures against developing countries should be eliminated at an early date. At the same time, my delegation is strongly opposed to the attempt to initiate and indefinitely maintain sanctions as a forcible means to change legitimate political and economic systems of individual countries.

In this regard, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/53/L.7/Rev.1.

In conclusion, my delegation reaffirms its commitment to actively join in the efforts of the international community with a view to eliminating as early as possible the unilateral coercive economic measures and establishing equitable international relations.

Mr. Vermeulen (South Africa): South Africa is committed to the principles of the sovereign equality of States and the freedom of international trade. These fundamental principles guide my delegation in our consideration of the draft resolution under agenda item 51, concerning the elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion.

The Heads of State or Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries addressed this very issue at the twelfth summit meeting held in Durban on 2-3 September 1998. On that occasion the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) condemned the unilateral application of coercive economic and other measures and the enactment of extraterritorial laws aimed at preventing developing countries from exercising their right to freely decide their own political, economic and social systems.

South Africa would like to reiterate and endorse the call of the NAM Durban summit on all countries not to recognize the unilateral or extraterritorial imposition of sanctions against other States and foreign companies or individuals and to refrain from adopting such coercive measures as a means of exerting pressure on non-aligned or other developing countries.

As the leaders of NAM noted, these measures constitute violations of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. They called on the international community to take effective action to arrest the trend, including attempts to introduce or internationalize such extraterritorial measures through multilateral institutions or agreements, and they specifically rejected the trend geared towards the strengthening of coercive unilateral measures through the Bretton Woods institutions.

My delegation would like to reiterate and underline our opposition to all forms of unilateral coercive measures, and we will vote in favour of the draft resolution before us.

Mr. Andjaba (Namibia): It gives me great pleasure to be able to participate in this debate and to once again reiterate the position of the Government of the Republic of Namibia on this issue, which is of great importance to us.

Two years ago the General Assembly adopted resolution 51/22 of 27 November 1996, on the item entitled "Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion". The resolution calls for the immediate repeal of unilateral extraterritorial laws which transcend national boundaries and impose sanctions on companies and nationals of other States. It also calls upon other Member States not to recognize unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures or legislative acts imposed by any State.

It is regrettable that since the adoption of that resolution, the Member State concerned continues to apply extraterritorial coercive measures in defiance of the demands of the international community. Despite the end of the cold war, external interventions through dubious means still persist. These interventions are being felt in most of the developing countries, such as Libya and Cuba to mention only two.

On several occasions during the sessions of this body and in other international forums, Namibia has registered its strong opposition to the laws enacted by a Member of the United Nations which seek to advance its political, economic and military interests in countries of the developing world, with a view to preventing those countries from exercising their inalienable rights to self-determination by freely choosing their political system and to determine their own path of economic, social and cultural development. The spirit and letter of these dubious laws contravene the resolutions of the General Assembly, in particular resolution 2131 (XX) of 21 December 1965, on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of other States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty.

These extraterritorial laws also contravene resolution 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, which prevents the use of economic, political or any other means to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights.

In this regard, my delegation once again calls upon the United States of America to refrain from adopting or implementing extraterritorial measures which are coercive in nature, such as the recent enactment of the Helms-Burton and the D'Amato-Kennedy Acts, which constitute a blatant violation of the principles of international law and the United Nations Charter.

The Government of Namibia — out of respect for the sovereignty of other States, the non-interference in the internal matters of other Member States, the promotion of international cooperation, peace and security, and the creation and maintenance of just and mutually beneficial relations among nations — will not entertain any unilateral measures by any State.

In the same vein, Namibia will also continue to work with other peace-loving countries in the United Nations to fight against coercive economic measures which are detrimental to the new world order, as signified by the development of the new global economy and liberal trade regimes.

Finally, my delegation fully supports and will vote in favour of draft resolution A/53/L.7/Rev.1.

Mr. Gambari (Nigeria): In my capacity as Chairman of the African Group for the month of October 1998, I have the honour to address the General Assembly, at its fifty-third session, on agenda item 51, entitled "Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion".

On behalf of the African Group, I would like to recall that, in its Final Communiqué, the most recent summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), which took place in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, on 8 June 1998, addressed the necessity for the elimination of unjust economic measures as an instrument of economic and political coercion. Noting that the implementation of coercive economic measures in many developing countries has resulted in considerable social and economic deprivation for the citizenry, the summit recommended, *inter alia*, that any extraterritorial measures used as a means of political and economic coercion be reviewed in such a way as to alleviate the negative impact on the lives of innocent citizens, both in the target State and in the neighbouring countries.

It is a reality that sanctions are a tool of enforcement and, as such, they have the tendency to constrain the economic and social life of the affected State. It is also a fact that sanctions regimes established by the United Nations normally include humanitarian provisions. However, the implementation of the humanitarian provisions related to international sanctions is often cumbersome and thereby leads to delays in the

procurement, delivery and distribution of essential commodities, such as food and medicine. As a result, the most vulnerable segments of the population — mostly women and children — are often those that are hit the hardest by the harmful effects of international sanctions.

Allow me to make reference to the report of the United Nations Secretary-General on the work of the Organization (A/53/1), which, *inter alia*, welcomes the concept of "smart sanctions", which would be targeted at pressuring Governments rather than ordinary people in the countries concerned. The implementation of such a new concept would surely encourage the tailoring of sanctions specifically to protect the majority of the populace from economic hardships.

In this connection, I would also like to draw attention to the open debate in the Security Council on the document entitled "Supplement to an Agenda for Peace: position paper of the Secretary-General on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations". In that document, former Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali put his finger right on the contradictions which arise from the employment of sanctions in efforts to maintain international peace and security. Several questions which were raised in that debate are relevant to our discussion of agenda item 51 in this Assembly.

First, how do all we Members of the United Nations ensure that sanctions are properly targeted at the decision-makers, rather than at the general population, of the countries concerned? Secondly, how do we make adequate provisions to protect innocent civilians, who invariably suffer disproportionately from the effect of international sanctions? Thirdly, how do we compensate the neighbouring States, which often bear the brunt of the enforcement of sanctions at great expense to their own economies and even to their own domestic peace and stability? Finally, are we fully aware that the prolongation of sanctions against a country could have the unintended effect of producing greater intransigence and defiance from the peoples and their respective Governments, which may indeed find ground by pleading that sanctions are an international conspiracy to unduly punish them?

Moreover, the unilateral imposition of measures by some countries on other States, in an attempt to influence the domestic politics of the targeted country or countries, give sanctions a very negative connotation and may very well undermine their moral force.

We in the African Group believe that the relationship between States Members of the United Nations and the international community should become increasingly more cooperative, rather than confrontational. If they did, extraterritorial coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion would be completely eradicated.

The African Group therefore supports the draft resolution before the General Assembly, which we hope will give relief, both in economic and social terms, to the ordinary citizens of affected countries. In this regard, we wish to note that, while it is the primary responsibility of the Security Council to maintain international peace and security, that mandate must be exercised without jeopardizing the well-being of the innocent, ordinary citizens of any nation.

The General Assembly, moreover, has the responsibility, not only to bring this fact to the attention of the Security Council and the international community as a whole, but also to adopt appropriate resolutions, such as the draft before us, to correct injustices resulting from the imposition of unilateral, extraterritorial coercive economic measures.

On the part of my delegation, we shall certainly vote in favour of this draft resolution.

Mr. Hasmy (Malaysia): My delegation is participating in this debate in order to join others in expressing Malaysia's position on this important issue, as we did on a related item pertaining to Cuba on 14 October 1998.

From the statements made in this Assembly today and in the past, and the responses received by the Secretary-General pursuant to a previous resolution of the Assembly on this subject, it is clear that there is considerable concern on the part of the international community over the use of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion. This concern is based on the following compelling arguments.

First, such coercive economic measures violate the established norms of relations among nations, including, in particular, those enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and numerous relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. They violate the universal principles of the equal sovereignty of States and non-intervention in their internal affairs.

Secondly, they violate the letter and spirit of the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization and the acknowledged objectives and purposes of many regional economic or trade organizations, which, *inter alia*, uphold and promote the universal principles of international trade, in particular, the principles of non-discrimination and freedom of international trade.

Thirdly, such unilateral measures are discriminatory in nature, intended to serve specific political agendas against the target country or countries.

Fourthly, these measures have an extraterritorial dimension, in that they extend the application of domestic laws to other countries.

Like many delegations that have addressed the Assembly on this subject, Malaysia is against the application of such extraterritorial coercive measures in inter-State relations. We fully subscribe to the final document of the twelfth summit of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Durban in September 1998, which, *inter alia*, called on all States to refrain from adopting or implementing extraterritorial or unilateral measures of coercion as a means of exerting pressure on non-aligned and other developing countries. It is clear that these measures are as unpopular as they are anachronistic — they are a throwback to a world of the past, characterized by its cold-war rigidity. They are out of step with the current trend towards increasing interdependence as well as interaction and interconnectedness among States, developed and developing, a trend impelled by a new and palpable universal sense of a truly global community. In an increasingly borderless world in which global trade plays a pivotal role in relations among States, there is really no place or justification for the continuation of such policies.

In expressing Malaysia's support for draft resolution A/53/L.7/Rev.1, which was initiated by the delegation of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, my delegation joins the call for the immediate repeal of such unilateral extraterritorial laws, in particular the D'Amato-Kennedy Act and the Helms-Burton Act, the main objectives of which are, *inter alia*, to restrict the target country's access to markets, capital, technology and investment in order to maximize the intended negative impact of that policy on the country or countries concerned. We urge the immediate repeal of such measures and their replacement with measures that are fair and consistent with the corpus of international laws, principles and regulations, in keeping with the spirit of our time. Indeed, my delegation urges not only the immediate rejection or abandoning of these measures but an earnest effort on the part of the international community to forge a new dynamic in relations among States that will animate and define this new spirit of our time. In this regard, my delegation believes that the United Nations has a unique role to play.

The Acting President (*interpretation from French*): We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item.

We shall now proceed to consider draft resolution A/53/L.7/Rev.1.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

May I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Burleigh (United States of America): The United States opposes the draft resolution proposed by Libya under agenda item 51, entitled "Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion". Member States should understand that this draft resolution is not about unilateralism, coercion, compulsion or extraterritoriality. This is an attempt by Libya to divert attention from its own non-compliance with terrorism-related sanctions and to shift the focus to those in the international community that seek to call States like Libya to account. The fact is that key sanctions on Libya are imposed by the United Nations. The Security Council reviews these sanctions every 120 days and will conduct the twentieth such review this week. After every review the Council has determined that conditions have not been met to lift sanctions.

The primary sponsor of this draft resolution has chosen not to respond positively to obligations imposed by international law, the United Nations Charter and the Security Council in several resolutions adopted under Chapter VII. It would be unfortunate to reward its intransigence with support of this draft resolution.

The use of sanctions as an effective and appropriate foreign policy tool by States, multilateral organizations and the United Nations itself is worthy of discussion. But when it is raised in a condemnatory way in a body such as the General Assembly of the United Nations by a State that does not respect Security Council resolutions, the subject is unworthy of the attention of Member States.

Every sovereign State has the right to decide with whom it will or will not trade. My Government regards economic sanctions as a legitimate instrument of foreign policy. The United States is by no means the only nation that resorts to such measures when necessary. In fact, applying the logic of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, the international community would never have imposed economic sanctions against the Republic of South Africa to force it to end the apartheid regime or against what was then known as Rhodesia — what is now Zimbabwe.

When faced with unacceptable international behaviour, the United States resorts to unilateral economic action reluctantly. Whenever possible, we work with other members of the global community to devise a collective response to egregious behaviour that violates international norms or threatens international security, as we did in the face of Iraq's armed aggression against its neighbour, Kuwait. But the United States has responded and will continue to respond unilaterally when faced with policies and actions that pose unusual and extraordinary threats to its vital interests, including its security, such as State support for international terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and of ballistic missiles and massive human rights abuses. We do not take such action lightly. When forced to act, we make it clear what policies we want to see changed and what the target State must do to have sanctions lifted.

Our sanctions also seek to target the subject Government, while avoiding harm to vulnerable civilian populations. For example, while enforcing a complete trade embargo against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the United States is also one of the largest contributors of humanitarian assistance to that nation.

We should also note that imposing economic sanctions entails real economic sacrifice on the part of the United States. That the United States is willing to make such sacrifices indicates the great importance we place on the issues involved. In responding to rogue State behaviour, the United States is defending not only its own interests but the security of the international community as a whole.

Mr. Tanç (Turkey): Turkey will vote in favour of draft resolution A/53/L.7/Rev.1 to demonstrate its opposition in principle to the extraterritorial application of national legislation, which is not in accordance with the general principles of international law. Our vote simply reflects that consideration. Turkey's vote, however, should not be construed as an endorsement of any position or policy adopted or pursued by the country submitting the draft resolution.

Mr. Wrabetz (Austria): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated country, Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area — Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway — align themselves with this statement.

The European Union wishes to take this opportunity to emphasize its unequivocal rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis contrary to international law. We have always rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. We stress that binding sanctions can be imposed on States only by and under the authority of the Security Council in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.

We wish to mention in this regard the legislation which provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third-country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.

We wish to reaffirm that the European Union's strong opposition, based both on law and on principle, to the imposition of secondary boycotts and legislation with extraterritorial effect and retroactivity remains unchanged; and we wish to state that the European Union has exercised its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures which appear to contravene international law, and it will continue to do so.

We have made these points clear on several occasions during this session of the General Assembly. The European Union must, however, make a firm and unmistakable distinction between measures imposed unilaterally by individual States and those which are undertaken with the authority of the Security Council or otherwise justified under international law. Unfortunately, the text before us today fails to make this distinction. The European Union has accordingly concluded that it is unable to support the draft text and will abstain in the voting.

The Acting President *(interpretation from French)*: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/53/L.7/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/53/L.7/Rev.1 was adopted by 80 votes to 2, with 67 abstentions (resolution 53/10).

The Acting President *(interpretation from French)*: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of vote on the resolution just adopted. May I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Duval (Canada) *(interpretation from French)*: Canada abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/53/L.7/Rev.1. Canada has always been firmly opposed to extraterritorial measures aimed at limiting the freedom of trade and investment of third parties.

While the resolution we have just considered requires that unilateral extraterritorial laws imposing sanctions on third parties must be repealed, it fails to distinguish clearly between measures taken under the authority of the Security Council and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and measures imposed unilaterally by States. Therefore, we have not been able to support the resolution.

Ms. Moglia (Argentina) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: Argentina abstained in the voting on the resolution just adopted because it takes the view that the application of economic sanctions should be approved by the pertinent United Nations organs and should be in conformity with the principles of the Charter.

Mr. Armitage (Australia): Australia draws a clear distinction between sanctions imposed unilaterally on other countries by individual States and those sanctions that are promulgated and implemented with the full authority of the Security Council. This resolution does not differentiate sufficiently between those two very different sets of circumstances. Furthermore, it contains other language which Australia considers problematic. In particular, its reference to the inalienable right of every State to choose the political, economic and social system that it deems most appropriate for the welfare of its people appears to undermine the universality of fundamental human rights.

For these reasons, Australia abstained in the voting on the resolution.

Mr. Hughes (New Zealand): New Zealand takes this opportunity to reiterate its long-standing opposition to national legislation that imposes unilateral sanctions that purport to have extraterritorial effect on third States.

The resolution just adopted, however, does not distinguish clearly between these unilateral sanctions and Security Council sanctions which are imposed legitimately under the United Nations Charter and which must be supported by all Member States.

For this reason, the New Zealand delegation abstained in the voting on the resolution.

Mr. Jordán Pando (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On behalf of my delegation, I wish to explain why Bolivia did not vote in favour of the resolution just adopted, but rather abstained, thus maintaining its position of 1996 in a case which has implications beyond those considered.

This does not mean that Bolivia does not condemn and reject any extraterritorial measures applied unilaterally, since they are a violation of international law.

We confirm our 1996 position and take the view that in this situation there are other considerations to be taken into account.

Mr. Ri Kwang Nam (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): My delegation supported the resolution entitled "Elimination of coercive measures as a means of political and economic compulsion" because of its position of principle that all unilateral coercive economic measures should be eliminated. In this regard, my delegation wants to clarify one point made by the United States a few moments ago. The representative of the United States should have expressed his country's apology for the unilateral coercive economic measures it has continuously imposed against our republic for the past 50 years, and should then have described a plan for repealing these measures.

My delegation was disappointed by his elusive remarks, and resolutely rejects his arguments. To us, power politics and coercive measures such as sanctions are senseless. The United States sanctions can only serve the purpose of jeopardizing peace and security on the Korean peninsula by inciting confrontation and hostility. We strongly urge that, instead of deceiving world public opinion and trying to rid itself of its responsibilities, the United States should immediately repeal all measures of economic sanctions.

The Acting President (*interpretation from French*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote on this item.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 51?

It was so decided.

Reports of the Fifth Committee

The Acting President (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly will now consider the reports of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 112, on agenda items 112 and 119 and on agenda item 143 (a).

If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the Fifth Committee that are before it today.

It was so decided.

The Acting President (*interpretation from French*): Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote or position.

The positions of delegations regarding the recommendations of the Fifth Committee have been made in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records. May I remind members that under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401 the Assembly agreed that

> "When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, i.e., either in the Committee or in plenary meeting unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee."

May I remind delegations too that, also in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Fifth Committee, I should like to advise representatives that we

are going to proceed to take decisions in the same manner as was done in the Committee, unless the Secretariat is notified otherwise.

Agenda item 112

Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations

Report of the Fifth Committee (Part I) (A/53/521)

The Acting President (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly will take action on two draft decisions recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report (A/53/521).

We turn first to draft decision I, entitled "Activities of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions during the fifty-second session of the General Assembly". The Fifth Committee adopted draft decision I without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft decision I was adopted.

The Acting President (*interpretation from French*): Draft decision II, entitled "Administrative arrangements for the International Trade Centre UNCTAD/WTO", was adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly too wishes to adopt the draft decision?

Draft decision II was adopted.

The Acting President (*interpretation from French*): We have thus concluded this stage of our consideration of agenda item 112.

Agenda items 112 (*continued*) **and 119**

Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations

Human resources management

Report of the Fifth Committee (A/53/533)

The Acting President (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly will now take action on the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 7 of its report (A/53/533). The draft resolution, entitled "Gratis personnel provided by Governments and other entities", was adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 53/11).

The Acting President (*interpretation from French*): We have thus concluded this stage of our consideration of agenda items 112 and 119.

Agenda item 143

Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations

(a) Financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations

Report of the Fifth Committee (A/53/522)

The Acting President (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly will take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report (A/53/522).

I call now on the representative of the United States, who wishes to speak in explanation of position before action is taken on the draft resolution.

Mr. Squadron (United States of America): When the General Assembly discussed the peacekeeping support account agenda item at the resumed fifty-second session last May, my delegation made it clear that the entire peacekeeping backstopping function needed a comprehensive review. This includes posts in the Department of Political Affairs and the Department of Management, as well as the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and other sections of the Secretariat. When the United States joined consensus in June on a compromise that established 400 posts for the support account and authorized $34.4 million for the year 1 July 1998 to 30 June 1999, we did so with the belief — a belief that was explicitly spelled out in the resolution — that the Secretariat would conduct its own review of the support account posts.

At the same time, the United States noted that in the past few years the support account submission by the Secretary-General has continued to increase, while the number, size and cost of peacekeeping operations have

declined dramatically. The Secretariat has also underspent by about $2 million annually what it has been authorized by the General Assembly to spend from the support account. The United States does not believe there is a linear, one-to-one relationship between the level of peacekeeping operations in the field and the level of backstopping required at Headquarters. However, it is illogical and unrealistic that a substantial decrease in the field would not have any impact at all on the needs at Headquarters.

The situation has not changed. The Secretariat did not present any new information to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions or the General Assembly for consideration at its fifty-third session. The United States again calls on the Secretary-General to engage in a comprehensive, post-by-post review of the peacekeeping support account in the context of his submission for the 1999-2000 support account year.

Turning to the present draft resolution, the United States believes that redeployment is a critical management tool that is essential to make the backstopping function at Headquarters more effective and efficient. The size of current peacekeeping operations, changes in work methods and the absence of start-ups or shut-downs of major missions make it essential that the Secretariat look closely at the distribution of posts and redeploy to match the needs. The General Assembly was told by representatives of the Secretariat — sceptically, I might add — that they would try to redeploy posts if instructed to do so by the General Assembly. It is not good enough for the Secretariat to try. It has been given a mandate by the General Assembly, and it must take a hard-nosed, critical look at its current and expected needs and readjust the staffing pattern accordingly.

The United States also calls on the Secretary-General, when filling the 400 support account posts that have again been authorized, to include within them those functions that he identified as critical to the backstopping function and requiring current military or civilian police expertise. The United States remains concerned that the transition between the gratis military personnel and their replacements, both civilians and seconded military and police officers, should take place seamlessly and with no gap in capability. The welfare of our peacekeepers is literally on the line. It would be unconscionable to endanger them because of a staffing gap.

The United States remains committed to the important work done by the peacekeepers of the United Nations. We stand ready to work with the Secretariat and other delegations to ensure that this work is done efficiently and effectively.

The Acting President (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 8 of its report (A/53/522).

The Fifth Committee adopted the draft resolution, entitled "Support account for peacekeeping operations", without a vote.

May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 53/12).

The Acting President (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of position on the resolution just adopted.

Mr. Manz (Austria): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated country, Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Iceland, align themselves with this statement.

The resolution just adopted is of great importance to the European Union, since it has an immediate impact on the safety of peacekeeping troops in the field. Representing the largest group of troop-contributing countries, the European Union has been guided first and foremost in this debate by the principle of the need to protect the lives of personnel in the field. They must not be put at risk. Therefore, we acknowledge the need to staff the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and other departments involved in backstopping peacekeeping adequately, not least to ensure adequate planning capacity and the ability to react swiftly to meet new challenges.

The European Union acknowledges the importance of replacing the gratis military officers with properly qualified people for the smooth functioning of backstopping structures. It is vital that we do not lose the expertise built up through the loan of those experienced officers and those with whom they worked. Throughout these past months, the European Union has emphasized

the need for appropriate hand-over arrangements in order to ensure continuity.

It is unfortunate that the General Assembly once again had to spend so much time on this issue. While we regret that inadequate information was provided by the Secretariat throughout this long exercise and share the frustration of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) in this context, we recognize the Secretariat's last-minute efforts in the Fifth Committee. We are particularly grateful to the fresh approach of the Military Adviser of the Secretary-General. He confirmed our view that military expertise must be preserved, and we trust that his expertise will be given due regard.

With regard to the number of posts we have given, it is perhaps of necessity arbitrary. This was inevitable given the lack of information available on which to base a more considered view.

The European Union accepted the ACABQ's recommendations. In order to reach consensus and meet the concerns of other delegations, we agreed to seven posts in addition to the 393 recommended by the Advisory Committee. Three of these have been allocated to the Rapidly Deployable Mission Headquarters (RDMHQ) and the Office of Internal Oversight Services. The remaining additionally approved posts should go to priority areas.

Again, the European Union is particularly concerned about the need for current seconded expertise. This resolution reaffirmed resolution 52/248, which requested the Secretary-General to ensure the required expertise of serving military officers and civilian police. In fact, if military expertise is substantially reduced the entire peacekeeping area of the United Nations is bound to suffer irreparable loss, with consequences for the safety and security of all the military and civilian personnel in the field. We also hope that seconded military expertise can eventually be extended to the RDMHQ, as requested by the Secretary-General and recognized by the ACABQ in paragraph 16 of its report contained in document A/53/418.

The European Union will look very closely at the next submission of the support account. In our view, this must inevitably reflect the significant restructuring of all departments dealing with peacekeeping backstopping, not just the Department of Peacekeeping Operations. With something like 70 fewer posts available to him, the Secretary-General must examine his real needs. We regard this decision as an opportunity for the Secretariat to reassess backstopping needs. It must act as an engine to promote restructuring. The European Union expects the Secretary-General to ensure that the necessary redeployment will take place as soon as possible and that he will report on the process of redeployment in the next support account report.

Out of principle, we have refrained from engaging in micro-management. This resolution gives the Secretariat an unusual degree of flexibility to carry out required changes, and we look forward to seeing an account of their implementation next year.

Mr. Kolby (Norway): Norway supported the resolution just adopted, and we welcome the fact that resources were found to finance two of the eight posts requested by the Secretary-General for the Rapidly Deployable Mission Headquarters. Norway has supported the establishment of the Rapidly Deployable Mission Headquarters since the idea was born and would also welcome seeing the six military posts financed, as requested by the Secretary-General and recognized by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

Norway shares the views expressed by the European Union regarding the replacement of the gratis military and police officers with qualified people and smooth and careful hand-over arrangements to secure continuity, while ensuring the required expertise of serving military officers and civilian police.

Mrs. Buergo Rodríguez (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): At the outset, my delegation wishes to thank the coordinator for this item, the representative of Australia, Mr. Miles Armitage, for the efforts he deployed throughout the negotiations in order to achieve the adoption by consensus of this resolution.

The item on which we have adopted this resolution has required a year of intensive work owing to the sensitivity of the issue and the political differences underlying it. We were also faced with a deplorable situation: the information provided on the item sometimes lacked coherence, precision and clarity. This undoubtedly gave rise to additional difficulties in the consideration of the reports, both in the Fifth Committee and in the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. Situations of this kind should not arise, and we trust that they will not recur.

The resolution we have adopted today reaffirms the decision taken by the Assembly last June to establish 400

support account-funded posts for the period from 1 July 1998 to 30 June 1999. It also requests the Secretary-General, when allocating those posts, to take into account the provisions contained in this resolution, particularly operative paragraphs 7 and 8. This means that only two civilian posts could be established for a rapidly deployable mission headquarters, not the eight originally asked for. We take note of the explanations given in this regard by the Secretariat in the Fifth Committee.

It emerged clearly from the negotiations that there is not yet any specific information that would truly justify that request. The Special Committee for Peacekeeping Operations itself still has doubts in this regard and has asked for more details about the differences in the functional responsibilities of the rapidly deployable mission headquarters and the Mission Planning Service.

My delegation looks forward with interest to the next report of the Secretary-General on the support account so that it can consider this matter as well as the question of the review of possible duplication and overlap between the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Political Affairs. The latter was called for by the General Assembly in its resolutions 50/214 and 52/220, and once again in operative paragraph 10 of this resolution.

Finally, we should like to underscore the important fact that all of the objective needs of support activities for peacekeeping operations at Headquarters should be at the centre of the decision-making process on this item. This will require genuine political will, and not an attempt to impose positions that correspond to the political interests of certain Member States, which, far from working to the advantage of the Organization, continues to undermine its transparency and credibility.

The Acting President (*interpretation from French*): We have thus concluded this stage of our consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 143.

Programme of work

The President (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to draw the General Assembly's attention to document A/INF/53/3/Add.2, which covers the period from 26 October to 10 December and which was circulated to delegations on Friday, 23 October.

The lists of speakers for the items mentioned in document A/INF/53/3/Add.2 are now open. In due course the General Assembly will be informed of the dates for the consideration of other agenda items and of any additions or changes.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.